

### ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the personal interview conducted on July 31, 2008 with the Examiner and a supervisory examiner. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and interview, and amended as discussed at the personal interview to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-11 and 13-23 remain in this application. Claim 12 has been canceled as the result of an earlier restriction requirement, and applicant retains the right to present that claim in a divisional application.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. The claim has been amended, making the rejection moot.

Claims 1-4, 9-11, and 13-15, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shuto *et al.* (U.S. 6,471,816) in view of Walker (U.S. 1,971,924). Claims 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shuto and Walker in further in view of Nagao *et al.* (U.S. 6,670,541); and claim 16 was rejected as being obvious in light of Shuto and Walker in further view of Mimura (U.S. 6,182,403). Claims 17-19 were also rejected as being unpatentable over Shuto in view of Walker. For the following reasons, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the second personal interview, it was discussed with the Examiner and her supervisor that the cited prior art references did not teach any non-conducting sealing material as shown in the application. The claims have been amended as discussed at that interview to better represent this feature of the invention. Claim 21 recites similar features. New claim 24 also recites that the sealing material is non-conducting, and also specifies that the product includes a “rigid base plate” and a “flexible power generating file laminated over said base plate”, a feature not found in the cited references. Accordingly, the claims are patentable over the references for at least the cited reasons.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is

determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. P+TS-36202.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:       / Robert F. Bodi /  
Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48540

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

September 2, 2008